
Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Kingman Field Office (KFO), AZ-310

NEPA DOCUMENT NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ-CO10-2012-0017-DNA

CASE FILE NUMBER: None

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: 2012 Mount Nutt Secret Pass Equestrian Access

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

APPLICANT (if any):

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

Install equestrian access at Secret Pass Wash along the east side of Mount Nutt Wilderness boundary. There is currently a boundary fence along Sections 8 and 16, T20N R19W with one blocked off equestrian access structure along Section 8 (approximately ¼ mile north of Secret Pass Wash). This structure would be removed from this area and the fence repaired. The structure would be installed in the fence between Sections 16 and 17 approximately 100 yards south of Secret Pass Wash. The work would be completed by volunteers from the Backcountry Horsemen under the oversight of BLM personnel.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: *Kingman Resource Management Plan/EIS*

Date Approved: March 1995

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

“Wilderness areas will be managed according to the provisions of law, BLM wilderness management regulations found at 43 CFR 8560 and subsequent wilderness management plans.”

– Page 27

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

EA-AZ- 025-93-036 *Boundaries of Mount Nutt Wilderness Area in Black Mountains* March 1993

EA-AZ-025-93-071 *Construction of Vehicle Barriers at Wilderness Boundaries* November 1993

BLM/AZ/PL-96/012 *Black Mountain Ecosystem Management Plan, Environmental Assessment and Decision Record* April 1996

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes. Equestrian access is being moved from one section to the adjacent one.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Yes. The current fence will not be move and will still function as designed to limit vehicular access to the wilderness.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes. The fence is not being moved, only the access for equestrians

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Yes. The current fence will still function as designed, with the equestrian access being moved from one section to the adjacent one.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes. The current fence will still function as designed, with the access being moved from one section to the adjacent one.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Phil Rheiner	Law Enforcement	BLM
Len Marceau	Park Ranger	BLM
Mike Stamm	WH&B Specialist	BLM
Rebecca Peck	Wildlife Biologist	BLM
Bob Hall	T&E Biologist	BLM
Don Simonis	Archeologist	BLM
Rick Colvin	Supv. ORP	BLM
Mike Blanton	Supv. Range Conv.	BLM
Martin Walsh		NPS
Karen Sussman		Intn. Soc. Protection Mustangs & Burros

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

_____/s/ Ramone B. McCoy_____
Project Lead/ NEPA Coordinator
Ramone McCoy

_____/1/25/2012_____
Date

_____/s/ Ruben A. Sanchez_____
Signature of the Responsible Official
Ruben A. Sanchez
Field Manager
Kingman Field Office

_____/3/12/2012_____
Date

PROJECT COORDINATION

Minutes

1:30 p.m.

1-17-2012

Facilitator: W Boyett Recorder: W Boyett Timekeeper: L Marceau

Agenda Items: Brief description, legal description, general location, name of presenter, time needed.

Rules: 90 minute meetings

No side conversations

Stick to time limits

Additional agenda items added at end of meeting if time permits

PAST DUE CLEARANCES: None

DECISION RECORDS TO BE DISCUSSED: None

PROJECT:

1) Mohave County Flood Control has four flood monitoring stations applied for. The monitoring stations that are applied for are as follows, Cyclopic AZA 35521, Basin Well AZA 35527, Flat Rock Spring AZA 35519, and Granite Peak AZA 35531. The proposed stations would each be 10 ft. above the ground with a 12 in. diameter aluminum pipe with various sensors mounted on or inside the pipe. The pipe is mounted in concrete 2 ft. deep and 2 ft. in diameter. The proposed ROW would be year round. Existing roads and washes would be used where possible but off road travel may be necessary for installation. (Melissa 10 min.). Proposed CX. 30 days for input. File located in share drive under Lands\MohaveCnty\MohaveCoFlood Control>alertmonitoringROWS. Becky Peck T&E/Wildlife, Tim Watkins Cultural, Amanda Deeds VRM, C Benson Wild Horse and Burro.

2) DNA for moving an equestrian access from section 8 T20N R19W to section 16. Work to be carried out by volunteers – Backcountry Horsemen. This is in the Mount Nutt Wilderness. (Ramone 10 min.). Access for horses and riders into wilderness. Not an allotment boundary fence used only to restrict vehicular access. 30 days or sooner for input. B Peck Wildlife, C Benson Wild Horse and Burro, T Watkins Cultural.

3) Assignment of communications use leases AZA 22683 at Hayden Peak, AZA 30115 at Willow Beach (the comm site, not the campground), and AZA 30116 at Patterson Slope from Jim Vine to Global Towers Partners. Compliance was conducted on these in October 2011 and there was a white microwave dish on the tower at Hayden Peak, which is not in compliance with the terms and conditions of the lease. The other facilities were in compliance. The intention is to process the assignments under one CX and the two leases in compliance would be assigned and the assignment of AZA 22683 would be held for denial pending being brought into compliance. It will be after snow melt before a compliance check can be done. (Andy 10 mins). 30 days to comment. B Peck Wildlife/T&E, T Watkins Cultural, A Deeds VRM.

4) Renewal of Nevada Red Gravel mineral material stockpiling, screening and loading area in sec. 8, T. 27 N., R. 21 W. (refer to map). This is adjacent to a patented mining claim which the owner bought to mine for decorative rock. The private lands were too steep to begin mining so an application was filed for a right-of-way which was granted in 2006. The intent was that this would be a short term arrangement (the right-of-way had a term of 3 years) and as material was taken from the private land the operation would be moved onto it and the public lands restored (except for the access road which is covered under a separate right-of-way). Upon the initial expiration of this right-of-way in 2009 there was not quite enough of a leveled area on the patented ground to move the operation onto it and the right-of-way was renewed for two years, which expired in September 2011. Melissa and I met with the holder's representative to discuss reclamation and since there is now enough level ground on the patented land to move the operation onto it is proposed to renew the right-of-way only for a term long enough for the holder to reclaim the area. (Andy 10 mins.). Holder had a reclamation plan. 30 days to comment. B Peck Wildlife/T&E, L Marceau VRM, T Watkins Cultural.

5) Mr. and Mrs. Warner had originally applied for a ROW for a road. After meeting with the couple they have requested a ROW for a ditch. The area is north of Kingman in T. 24N., R. 14W., sec. 30 SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$. The ROW would be 15 ft. by 150 ft. to divert water around their property. There is a fence along the section line that would not be disturbed. The road was put in cutting across the natural drainage. Application received in 2007. (Melissa 10 min.). 30 days to comment. T Watkins Cultural, B Peck Wildlife/T&E, M Blanton Range.

6) Reminder for Wilderness characteristic baseline to Ramone by the middle of February.

7) Route evaluation January 30 to February 3. E-mail to follow. Southern Poachie unit then Bagdad unit. June 25 to June 29, July 30 to August 3 for the next two route evaluations.

Attendees: Becky Peck, Chad Benson, Don McClure, Ramone McCoy, Andy Whitefield, Len Marceau, Amanda Deeds, Dave Daniels, Randy Allison.

Next meeting: Feb. 8, 2012 10:30 a.m.

Facilitator: Len Marceau

Recorder: Amanda Deeds

Timekeeper: Andy Whitefield

